



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/826,942

04/16/2004

William C. To

7784-000728

1620

65961 7590 02/02/2009  
HARNESS DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

JAKOVAC, RYAN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2445

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/02/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/826,942	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TO, WILLIAM C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RYAN J. JAKOVAC	<b>Art Unit</b> 2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed 12/01/2008 has been entered.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,401,013 to McElreath in view of US 6,122,575 to Schmidt et al, and further in view of US 2003/0014426 to Gimbert et al (hereinafter Gimbert).

Regarding claim 1, 9, 11, 14, McElreath teaches an apparatus for performing configuration management relative to an aircraft, the apparatus comprising:

a portable computer having a processor and memory configured to communicate with a plurality of components of the aircraft and to receive data transmitted from one or more modules of the aircraft components (McElreath, abstract, a laptop is coupled to avionics equipment on-board the aircraft. See also fig. 1, laptop is connected to a plurality of aircraft components. See also col. 2:45-65, col. 3 to col. 4:52. See also Schmidt, col. 3:45 to col. 5:65, laptop is connected to the electronic control unit of an aircraft auxiliary power unit.); and

a web server module executable by the processor to include at least some of the received data in one or more web page markups providing a plurality of maintenance and/or engineering functions selectable by a user of the computer and performable via the computer as to one or more components of the aircraft (Gimbert, [0026-0028], received data is represented as a web page. Web pages display a plurality of selectable links (i.e. functions).); and

a web browser module executable by the processor to display the one or more web page markups as one or more web pages on a display of the computer (Gimbert, fig. 4. See also [0026-0028] and the abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of McElreath with the teachings of Gimbert in order to enable aircraft information to be communicated to a user via a computer including a browser (Gimbert, abstract). It would have been further obvious to combine the teachings of McElreath and Gimbert with the teachings of Schmidt in order to be able to download information from an

Art Unit: 2445

aircraft component and display the downloaded diagnostic information through an on screen interface (Schmidt, col. 5:20-50. See also fig. 7.).

Regarding claim 3, The combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 1, the computer further comprising a configuration file resident in the computer for holding the received data, the server module executable by the processor to process data from the configuration file for inclusion in the one or more web page markups (Gimbert, [0026-0028], received data is represented as a web page. See also the abstract, system enabling aircraft and aircraft engine information to be communicated to a user via a computer including a browser. See also fig. 4-5.).

Regarding claim 4, 13, the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 3, further comprising or more constructs included in the web page markups (Gimbert, [0026-0028], server renders web pages.), the computer further comprising a construct processing module configured with the server for execution by the processor to use the data from the configuration file to produce one or more web page markups (Gimbert, fig. 4-5.).

Regarding claim 5, The combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 4, further comprising a script executable by the processor through the server to activate the construct processing module (Gimbert, [0026-0028], server renders web pages. See also, Abstract.)

Art Unit: 2445

5. Claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt, in further view of US 2003/0208579 to Brady, JR. et al (hereinafter Brady).

Regarding claim 2, The combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein the maintenance and/or engineering functions comprise one or more of the following: a configuration management function, a software upgrade function, a health status function, and a troubleshooting function (Brady, abstract, software in line-replaceable units in an in-flight entertainment system (i.e. aircraft components) are updated in response to a user request.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brady with the teachings of McElreath, Schmidt and Gimbert in order to be able to update the software in aircraft components such as line-replaceable units of an in-flight entertainment center (Brady, abstract.).

Regarding claim 8, 10, 15, 16, the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 1, the computer further operable to perform at least one of updating software included in at least one of the components of the aircraft, collecting performance data from at least one of the components of the aircraft, and operating a troubleshooting tool relative to at least one of the components of the aircraft (Brady, abstract, software in line-replaceable units in an in-flight entertainment system (i.e. aircraft components) are updated in response to a user request. See also fig. 7.).

Regarding claim 7, The combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 3, but does not expressly disclose wherein the aircraft is included in a fleet managed via a network operations center.

However, these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. See *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the nonfunctional descriptive material with the claimed invention because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the descriptive material does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Brady discloses a network operations center, the computer further operable to deliver at least one of the data from the configuration file and the one or more web pages specific to a given one of the aircraft to the network operations center (Brady, fig. 1, management terminal.).

6. Claim 17, 19-22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of Gimbert and further in view of Brady.

Regarding claim 17, 21, 22, the combination of Schmidt and Gimbert teaches a method of providing configuration management relative to an aircraft, the method performed by a portable computer having a processor and a memory, the method comprising:

the processor causing the portable computer to access one or more components of an aircraft and to retrieve data from the one or more components in response to a user request (Schmidt, col. 5:20-50, in response to user instruction (i.e. request) data is retrieved from the aircraft component.);

the processor executing the web server module to dynamically format at least some of the data retrieved from the one or more aircraft components into one or more web page markups for display as one or more web pages via the browser module (Gimbert, fig. 4. See also [0026-0028] and the abstract, received data is represented as a web page.);

the processor receiving user input via the browser module indicating a management function to be performed on at least one of the one or more aircraft components (Gimbert, [0026-0028], selectable links. [0038], user to navigate through the web page using a plurality of hyperlinks. [0031], web pages as enabling a user to access specific features associated with the user and to identify tasks performed within the system.); and

the processor causing software to be downloaded from the portable computer to the at least one of the one or more components in response to the user input (Brady, abstract, software in line-replaceable units in an in-flight entertainment system (i.e. aircraft components) are updated in response to a user request.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Schmidt and Gimbert in order to enable aircraft information to be



Art Unit: 2445

communicated to a user via a computer including a browser (Gimbert, abstract). It would have been further obvious to combine the teachings of Brady with the teachings of Schmidt and Gimbert in order to be able to update the software in aircraft components such as line-replaceable units of an in-flight entertainment center (Brady, abstract.).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of Schmidt, Gimbert, and Brady discloses the method of claim 17, further comprising the processor displaying data describing (a) one or more hardware components of the aircraft and (b) software resident in the one or more hardware components (Brady, fig. 7.).

Regarding claim 20, the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt teaches the apparatus of claim 17, further comprising transferring data to the one or more aircraft components based on user input via one of the one or more web pages (Brady, abstract, software in line-replaceable units in an in-flight entertainment system (i.e. aircraft components) are updated in response to a user request. See also Gimbert [0026-0028]).

7. Claims 6, 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of McElreath, Gimbert, and Schmidt, and further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claims 6, 12, and 18, Official Notice is taken that using standard protocols such as CGI (to obtain data from a file) or SNMP (to retrieve data over a network) are well

Art Unit: 2445

known. Regarding claim 18, obtaining the ping status of a network element is well known in the art.

8. Claims 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Schmidt, Gimbert, and Brady, and further in view of Official Notice.

Regarding claim 18, Official Notice is taken that obtaining the ping status of a network element and displaying the ping status of network element is well known in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN J. JAKOVAC whose telephone number is (571)270-5003. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2445

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RJ/

/Larry D Donaghue/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454